

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	NATURE AND STAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS	1
II.	SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	1
III.	STATEMENT OF FACTS.....	5
A.	The Industry’s Concern About Standardizing Technology That Only One Vendor Would Be Able To Sell.....	5
B.	TruePosition’s Assurances To The Industry And Andrew That UTDOA/SDCCH Licenses Would Be Available	7
C.	TruePosition’s Silence Concerning An Unwillingness To Grant UTDOA/SDCCH Licenses	10
D.	Andrew’s Decision To Develop UTDOA/SDCCH Products And Help TruePosition Standardize UTDOA/SDCCH.....	14
E.	TruePosition’s Agreement To “Create A Solution That We All Benefit From”	16
F.	Andrew’s And TruePosition’s Joint Efforts To Standardize UTDOA/SDCCH.	18
G.	TruePosition’s Post-Standardization Refusal To Grant UTDOA/SDCCH Licenses To Other Vendors	24
IV.	ARGUMENT.....	28
A.	TruePosition’s Claims Should Be Barred Under The Doctrine Of Equitable Estoppel	28
1.	By Its Affirmative Conduct And Silence, TruePosition Led Andrew Reasonably To Infer That TruePosition Did Not Intend To Enforce Its Patent Against Andrew.....	31
2.	Relying On TruePosition’s Conduct And Silence, Andrew Joined Forces With TruePosition To Get UTDOA/SDCCH Standardized And Successfully Bid On A Contract To Sell UTDOA/SDCCH Equipment.....	36
3.	Due To Its Reliance, Andrew Will Be Materially Prejudiced If TruePosition Is Allowed To Recover Damages On Its Claims And Enjoin Andrew From Practicing UTDOA/SDCCH.....	38